

REMARKS

Introduction

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 23, and 24 have been amended. Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.

No new matter is being presented since all amendments are supported by the originally submitted specification, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC § 112

Claim 17

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner stated that “the different elasticity of the elastic members was not described in the specification in such a way to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.”

It is respectfully submitted that in the specification, for example, at paragraph 0036, line 6, “[t]he elastic unit can be implemented in various forms,” provides sufficient support for different elasticity. For example, if the elastic members are provided as two springs, such as described in the embodiment of FIG. 7, two springs of different forms, such as different thicknesses, it would be inherent to one of ordinary skill in the art that the two different springs would have different elasticity. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the phrase “different elasticity” of the elastic members is supported in the specification “to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains,” and therefore withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons stated below.

The Examiner alleges that in claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-9, it is confusing as to how a paper is both fed and discharged through the discharging roller and the idle roller. In order to address the Examiner’s concerns, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite *inter alia*, “a

sheet of paper is discharged through the paper-discharging rollers and the idle rollers.”

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-18, the Examiner alleges that it is unclear what is “formed between the opposite ends.” It is respectfully submitted that contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, it is quite clear from the claim recitation that it is the middle portion of the supporting bracket which is formed between the opposite ends of the supporting bracket. However, in order to address the Examiner’s concerns, claim 10 has been amended to make it even more evident that the middle portion of the supporting bracket is formed between the opposite ends of the supporting bracket. Accordingly, withdraw of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 11, the Examiner states that the limitation “the support bracket” in line 2 has insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 11 has been amended to change “the support bracket” in line 2 to “the supporting bracket”. Accordingly, the supporting bracket as presently recited in line 2 of claim 11 has proper antecedent basis in claim 10, and withdraw of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 13, the Examiner alleges that there is insufficient structure to understand how the supporting plate moves toward the supporting bracket. It is respectfully submitted that it is clear from the recitation of claim 10 that the spacing adjustment unit provides the adjustment of distance between the supporting plate and the middle portion of the supporting bracket when an external force is exerted on one of the supporting plate and the supporting bracket. However, in order to address the Examiner’s concerns claim 13 has been amended to additionally recite, “when the external force is exerted on one of the supporting plate and the supporting bracket, a portion of the supporting plate moves toward the middle portion of the supporting bracket while a distance between the middle portion of the supporting bracket and the paper discharging roller is maintained constant.” Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 18, the Examiner states that the limitation “the support bracket” in line 2 has insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 18 has been amended to change “the support bracket” in line 2 to “the supporting bracket”. Accordingly, the supporting bracket as presently recited in

Serial No.: 10/684,412
Docket No.: 102-1001
Amendment Dated August 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action of May 26, 2005

line 2 of claim 18 has proper antecedent basis in claim 10, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 19 and its dependent claims 20-23, the Examiner alleges that it is unclear what is “formed between opposite ends.” It is respectfully submitted that contrary to the Examiner’s assertions it is quite clear from the claim recitation that it is the middle portion of the supporting bracket which is formed between the opposite ends of the supporting bracket. However, in order to address the Examiner’s concerns, claim 19 has been amended to make it even more evident that the middle portion of the supporting bracket is formed between the opposite ends of the supporting bracket. Accordingly, withdraw of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 23, the Examiner states that it is unclear what is meant by the recited “a center.” In order to address the Examiner’s concerns, Claim 23 has been amended to recite *inter alia*, “an axis passing through a center of each of the paper-discharging rollers.” Accordingly, withdraw of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 24, the Examiner states that the limitation “the support plate” in line 6 has insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 24 has been amended to change “the support plate” in line 6 to “the supporting plate”. Accordingly, the supporting plate as presently recited in line 6 of claim 24 has proper antecedent basis in line 3 of claim 24, and withdraw of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-6, 10, 12-16, and 18-23

Claims 1-6, 10, 12-16, and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,265,869 (Morita). This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons stated below.

Regarding independent claim 1, at item 3 of the Office Action mailed on May 26, 2005, the Examiner alleges that FIGS. 1-2B of Morita shows “a paper-discharging apparatus used with an image-forming device, the paper-discharging apparatus provided with a paper-discharging roller (8) and an idle roller (9) disposed in a paper-discharging port side of the image-forming

device, in which a sheet of paper is fed and discharged through the paper-discharging roller (8) and the idle roller (9)." The Examiner also alleges that Morita shows "the paper-discharging apparatus including a supporting plate (5) installed at the paper-discharging port side of the image forming device; a supporting bracket (7) mounted on the supporting plate (5)... to rotatably support the idle roller (9) facing the paper-discharging roller (8); and a spacing adjustment unit (10, 12, 13, 15) constantly maintaining a contact pressure between the paper-discharging roller (8) and the idle roller (9)." The Examiner therefore appears to be alleging that the conveying roller 8, the follower roller 9, the second guide plate 5, and the support plate 7 of Morita are analogous to the paper-discharging roller, the idle roller, the supporting plate, and the supporting bracket recited claim 1, respectively. The Examiner also appears to be alleging that the support shaft 10, the springs 12 and 13, and the bolts 15 of Morita are analogous to the spacing adjustment unit recited in claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that FIG. 1-2A of Morita illustrates bolts 15 and springs 13 connecting a support plate 7 and a second guide plate 5 at outer ends of the second guide plate 5. Morita also illustrates a support shaft supporting 10 supporting springs 12 on outer portions of a follower roller 9. However, Morita does not disclose "a spacing adjustment unit disposed between the idle rollers to constantly maintain a contact pressure between the paper-discharging rollers and the idle rollers," as presently recited in claim 1 of Applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that the positioning of the spacing adjustment unit of claim 1 between the idle rollers provides the benefits of, among other things, being able to "constantly maintain a contact pressure between the paper discharging roller and the idle roller," as presently recited in claim 1 of Applicant's invention. Therefore, Morita fails to disclose, among other things, a spacing adjustment unit disposed between the idle rollers, as recited in claim 1. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the... claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ 2d 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). "The elements must be arranged as required by the claim..." In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Accordingly, since Morita does not teach every element as recited in independent claim 1,

Morita can not be properly used to reject claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over Morita, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited. Further, for at least the reasons that claims 2-6 depend from allowable claim 1, claims 2-6 are also allowable, and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Regarding independent claim 10, at page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 1 of Morita shows “a paper-discharging apparatus to discharge a sheet of paper between a paper-discharging roller (8) and a idle roller (9) which are disposed in a paper-discharging port side of an image forming device.” The Examiner further alleges that Morita shows the paper-discharging apparatus “including a supporting plate (5) formed on the paper-discharging port side thereof; a supporting bracket (7) having opposite ends mounted on the supporting plate (5), and having a middle portion, on which the idle roller (9) is rotatably mounted to contact the paper-discharging roller (8), formed between the opposite ends; and a spacing adjustment unit (including 13) disposed between the supporting plate (5) and the middle portion of supporting bracket (7) to adjust a distance between the supporting plate (5) and the middle portion of the supporting bracket (7) when an external force is exerted on one of the supporting plate (5) and the supporting bracket (7).” The Examiner therefore appears to be alleging that the conveying roller 8, the follower roller 9, the second guide plate 5, and the support plate 7 of Morita are analogous to the paper-discharging roller, the idle roller, the supporting plate, and the supporting bracket recited claim 10, respectively. The Examiner also appears to be alleging that the springs 13 of Morita are analogous to the spacing adjustment unit recited in claim 10.

Applicant respectfully points out that the support plate 7 of FIG. 1 of Morita is mounted to the second guide bracket 5 at outer ends of the support plate 7 via bolts 15 and springs 13, and the springs 13 are limited to being disposed between the support plate 7 and the second guide plate 5 at the outer ends of the support plate 7. Hence, Morita does not teach “a spacing adjustment unit to flexibly couple the supporting plate and the middle portion of the supporting bracket to adjust a distance between the supporting plate and the middle portion of the supporting bracket when an external force is exerted on one of the supporting plate and the supporting bracket,” as recited in claim 10 of Applicant’s invention. It is respectfully submitted

that the positioning of the spacing adjustment unit of claim 10 between the supporting plate and the middle portion of the supporting bracket provides benefits such as, among other things, being able to “adjust a distance between the supporting plate and the middle portion of the supporting bracket when an external force is exerted on one of the supporting plate and the supporting bracket,” as recited in independent claim 10 of Applicant’s invention. Therefore, Morita fails to disclose, at least, a spacing adjustment unit as recited in independent claim 10.

Accordingly, since Morita does not teach every element as recited in independent claim 10, Morita can not be properly used to reject this claim. See anticipation requirement *supra*. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable over Morita, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited. Further, for at least the reasons that claims 12-16 and 18 depend from allowable independent claim 10, claims 12-16 and 18 are also allowable, and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Regarding independent claim 19, at pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that FIGS. 1-2B of Morita shows “a paper-discharging apparatus to discharge a sheet of paper between a plurality of paper-discharging rollers (8 and 8) and a plurality of idle rollers (9 and 9), which are rotated by corresponding ones of the paper-discharging rollers (8 and 8) in an image-forming device.” The Examiner further alleges that Morita shows “the paper-discharging apparatus including a supporting plate (5) formed on the paper-discharging port side thereof; a supporting bracket (7) having opposite ends mounted on the supporting plate (5), and having a middle portion, on which the follower rollers (9) are rotatably mounted to contact corresponding ones of the paper-discharging rollers (8), formed between the opposite ends; and a spacing adjustment unit (12 and 13) disposed between the supporting plate 5 and the middle portion of the supporting bracket (7) to maintain a contact pressure generated between corresponding ones of the paper-discharging rollers (8) and the idle rollers (9) regardless of an external force exerted on the supporting plate (5).”

As pointed out above regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it appears the Examiner is alleging that a second guide plate 5, a support plate 7, and springs 12 and 13 of Morita are analogous to the supporting plate, the supporting bracket, and the space adjustment unit, respectively, as recited in independent claim 19. It is respectfully submitted that although FIGS. 1 -2A of Morita illustrate the springs 13 elastically connecting the support plate 7 to the

second guide plate 5 at opposite ends of the support plate 7, and the springs 12 elastically connecting the support plate 7 to follower rollers 9 at a middle portion of the support plate 7 formed between the outer ends, Morita does not teach “a spacing adjustment unit to flexibly couple the supporting plate and the middle portion of the supporting bracket...,” as recited in independent claim 19. It is respectfully submitted that the spacing adjustment unit recited in independent claim 19 provides benefits such as, among other things, being able to “maintain a contact pressure generated between corresponding ones of the paper-discharging rollers and the idle rollers regardless of an external force exerted on one of the supporting plate and the supporting bracket,” as recited in claim 19. Therefore, Morita fails to teach, among other things, the spacing adjustment unit as recited in independent claim 19.

Accordingly, since Morita does not teach every element as recited in independent claim 19, Morita can not be properly used to reject claim 19. See anticipation requirement *supra*. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reason that Morita does not teach every feature recited in independent claim 19, this claim is allowable over Morita, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited. Further, for at least the reasons that claims 20-23 depend from allowable independent claim 19, claims 20-23 are also allowable, and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is earnestly solicited.

In addition to the points provided above regarding claims 21 and 23, it is respectfully submitted that claims 21 and 23 are allowable for the following additional reasons. Regarding claim 21, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 1-2B of Morita show “the middle portion of the supporting bracket (7) is spaced apart from the supporting plate (5) by a distance which varies according to a deformation of the supporting plate (5).” It is respectfully submitted that Morita illustrates that the support plate 7 is movable with respect to the second plate 7. However, Morita does not teach where “the middle portion of the supporting bracket is spaced apart from the supporting plate which varies according to a deformation of the supporting plate. As illustrated in FIG. 1 of Morita, when a force is exerted on the second guide plate 5, the entire second guide plate 5 moves simultaneously with respect to the support plate 7 without deformation of the second guide plate 7. Therefore, Morita fails to disclose, among other things, the deformation of the supporting plate, as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, since Morita does not teach every element as recited in claim 21, Morita can not be properly used to reject claim

21. Thus, this claim is allowable over Morita for these additional reasons, and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Regarding claim 23, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 1 of Morita shows “the middle portion of the supporting bracket (7) is not deformed in a direction perpendicular to a center passing through the paper-discharging rollers (8) while the supporting plate (5) is elastically deformed.” It is respectfully submitted that Morita illustrates that the support plate 7 is movable with respect to the second plate 7. However, Morita does not teach where “the middle portion of the supporting bracket is not deformed in a direction perpendicular to an axis passing through a center of each the paper-discharging rollers while the supporting plate is elastically deformed,” as recited in claim 23. As illustrated in FIG. 1 of Morita, when a force is exerted on the second guide plate 5, the entire second guide plate 5 moves simultaneously with respect to the support plate 7 without deformation of the second guide plate 7. Therefore, Morita fails to disclose where the middle portion of supporting bracket is not deformed while the supporting plate is elastically deformed, as recited in claim 23. Accordingly, since Morita does not teach every element as recited in claim 23, Morita can not be properly used to reject claim 23. Thus, this claim is allowable over Morita for these additional reasons, and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1-3, 10-15, 18, and 24-25

Claims 1-3, 10-15, 18, and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/130463 A1 (Michel). This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons stated below.

Regarding independent claim 1, at item 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 6 of Michel shows “a paper-discharging apparatus used with an image-forming device, the paper-discharging apparatus provided with a paper-discharging roller (including 24) and an idle roller (below 34c) disposed in a paper-discharging port side of the image-forming device, in which a sheet of paper is fed and discharged through the paper-discharging roller (including 24) and the idle roller (below 34c).” The Examiner further alleges that Michel shows “the paper-discharging apparatus including a supporting plate (46) installed at the paper-discharging port side of the image-forming device; a supporting bracket (near 34c) mounted on the supporting

plate (46)... to rotatably support the idle roller (below 34c) facing the paper-discharging roller (including 24); and a spacing adjustment unit (including 34c, 54, 58 of, and 60) constantly maintaining a contact pressure between the paper-discharging roller (including 24) and the idle roller (below 34c).

Although the Examiner refers to an axle 24 while calling it a paper-discharging roller, it is our understanding that the Examiner intended to refer to a traction roller 22 of Michel as being analogous to the paper-discharging roller recited in claim 1. It is also our understanding that the Examiner intended to refer to an idler roller 28 of Michel below a spring 34c as being analogous to the idle roller recited in claim 1. Further, although the Examiner refers to reference number 46 while calling it a supporting plate, it is our understanding that the Examiner intended to refer to a pivoting lever member 36b of Michel as being analogous to the supporting plate recited in claim 1. Further, as best as can be understood from the rejection, it appears the Examiner is referring to a roller frame 30 of Michel (near 34c) as being analogous to the supporting bracket recited in claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that FIG. 6 of Michel illustrates traction rollers 22 and idler rollers 28 being disposed to contact each other, with each idler roller 28 being limited to having a separate roller frame 30 and being independently connected to a pivoting lever member 36a or 36b. Accordingly, Michel does not teach the use of "a supporting bracket coupled at opposite ends thereof to the supporting plate to rotatably support the idle rollers facing the paper-discharging rollers," as presently recited in independent claim 1 of Applicant's invention. Stated differently, as illustrated in FIG. 6 of Michel, each roller frame 30 is limited to supporting a single corresponding idler roller 28. Further, although an axle 32 is connected to each of the plural roller frames 30, the axle 32 is not coupled at opposite ends thereof to either pivoting member 36a or 36b. Therefore, Michel fails to teach, among other things, the supporting bracket as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, since Michel does not teach every element as recited in independent claim 1, Michel can not be properly used to reject this claim. See anticipation requirement *supra*.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over Michel, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly

solicited. Further, for at least the reasons that claims 2-3 depend from allowable independent claim 1, claims 2-3 are also allowable, and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Regarding independent claim 10, at pages 10-11 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 6 of Michel shows “a paper-discharging apparatus to discharge a sheet of paper between a paper-discharging roller (including 24) and an idle roller (below 34c), which are disposed in a paper-discharging port side of an image forming device.” The Examiner further alleges the Michel shows the paper-discharging apparatus “including a supporting plate (46) formed on the paper-discharging port side thereof; a supporting bracket (directly below 34c) having opposite ends mounted on the supporting plate 46, and having a middle portion, on which the idle roller (below 34c) is rotatably mounted to contact the paper-discharging roller (including 24), formed between the opposite ends (i.e., the entire supporting bracket including the opposite ends thereof are mounted on the supporting plate (46) via spring (34c)....); and a spacing adjustment unit (including 34c, 54, 58, and 60) disposed between the middle portion of the supporting bracket (directly below 34c) and the supporting plate (46) to adjust a distance between the supporting plate (46) and the middle portion of the supporting bracket (directly below 34c) when an external force is exerted on one of the supporting plate (46) and the supporting bracket (directly below 34c).

As pointed out above regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, although the Examiner refers to an axle 24 while calling it a paper-discharging roller, it is our understanding that the Examiner intended to refer to a traction roller 22 of Michel as being analogous to the paper-discharging roller recited in claim 10. It is also our understanding that the Examiner intended to refer to an idler roller 28 of Michel below a spring 34c as being analogous to the idle roller recited in claim 10. Further, although the Examiner refers to reference number 46 while calling it a supporting plate, it is our understanding that the Examiner intended to refer to a pivoting lever member 36b of Michel as being analogous to the supporting plate recited in claim 10. Further, it is our understanding that the Examiner is referring to a roller frame 30 of Michel (directly below 34c) as being analogous to the supporting bracket recited in claim 10.

It is respectfully submitted that FIG. 6 of Michel illustrates a roller frame 30, having an idler roller 28 rotatably mounted thereon. However, the roller frame 30 is limited to being elastically attached to a pivoting lever member 36a or 36b via a spring 34(a-d). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Michel does not teach the use of "a supporting bracket having opposite ends fixedly coupled to opposite ends of the supporting plate, respectively, and having a middle portion formed between the opposite ends thereof, on which the idle roller is rotatably mounted to contact the paper-discharging roller," as presently recited in independent claim 10 of Applicant's invention. Stated differently, as illustrated in FIG. 6 of Michel, one point of the roller frame 30 is attached to a spring bracket 40, 43, 48, or 52, which in turn is connected at one end of the pivoting lever member 36a or 36b via the spring 34(a-d), and therefore opposite ends of roller frame 30 are not respectively coupled to opposite ends of the pivoting lever member 36b. Therefore, Michel fails to teach, among other things, the supporting bracket as recited in independent claim 10 of Applicant's invention. Accordingly, since Michel does not teach every element as recited in independent claim 10, Michel can not be properly used to reject claim 10. See anticipation requirement *supra*.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 10 is allowable over Michel, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited. Further, for at least the reasons that claims 11-15 and 18 depend from allowable independent claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11-15 and 18 are also allowable, and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited.

Regarding independent claim 24, at page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 6 of Michel shows "a paper-discharging apparatus to discharge paper from an image forming device having discharging rollers 24, including a supporting plate 46; and a supporting bracket (including 32, the element directly below 34c and 30) with idle rollers (including the idle roller below 34c and the idle roller 28) facing the paper-discharging rollers 24, flexibly mounted to the support plate 46 to maintain a constant contact pressure between the idle rollers and respective paper-discharging rollers."

As pointed out above regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, although the Examiner refers to an axle 24 while calling it paper-discharging rollers, it is our understanding

that the Examiner intended to refer to traction rollers 22 of Michel as being analogous to the paper-discharging rollers recited in claim 24. Further, although the Examiner refers to reference number 46 while calling it a supporting plate, it is our understanding that the Examiner intended to refer to a pivoting lever member 36b of Michel as being analogous to the supporting plate recited in claim 24.

It is respectfully submitted that FIG. 6 of Michel illustrates roller frames 30 each supporting a single corresponding idler roller 28. Further, each roller frame 30 is limited to being independently attached to a pivoting lever member 36a or 36b via one of springs 34(a-d). Further, an axle 32 is connected to each of the plurality of roller frames 30, and not connected to either pivoting lever 36a or 36b. Accordingly, Michel does not teach the use of "a supporting bracket including idle rollers facing the paper-discharging rollers, the supporting bracket fixedly mounted at opposite ends thereof to the supporting plate, and flexibly mounted at a middle portion thereof to the supporting plate to maintain a constant contact pressure between the idle rollers and respective paper-discharging rollers," as presently recited in claim 24 of Applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that the supporting bracket of claim 24 provides benefits such as, for example, one member being able to maintain a constant contact pressure between all of the idle rollers and the respective paper-discharging rollers, as recited in independent claim 24 of Applicant's invention. In contrast, the idler rollers 28 of Michel are each individually held against traction rollers 22 by forces of respective springs 34a-34d. Therefore, Michel fails to teach, among other things, the supporting bracket as recited in independent claim 24. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that since Michel does not teach every element as recited in independent claim 24, Michel can not be properly used to anticipate independent claim 24. See anticipation requirement *supra*.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 24 is allowable over Michel, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited. Further, for at least the reason that claim 25 depends from allowable independent claim 24, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25 is also allowable, and withdrawal of the rejection of this claim is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/684,412
Docket No.: 102-1001
Amendment Dated August 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action of May 26, 2005

Conclusion

There being not other objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in a condition of allowance, and an early action to this effect is courteously solicited.

No Fee has been incurred by this Amendment. However, if any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 502827.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

By: Stev M. DiPasquo

Steven M. DiPasquo
Registration No. 54,754

Dated: 8/25/05
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901